

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.N.KRISHNAN

TUESDAY, THE 4TH SEPTEMBER 2007 / 13TH BHADRA 1929

RP.No. 757 of 2007(J)IN W.P.(C).21099/2007

AGAINST THE JUDGEMENT IN WPC.21099/2007 Dated 24/07/2007
OS.109/2005 of MUN-MAGI COURT, PARAVOOR
(IA. 1158 /2005)

REVIEW PETITIONER/PETITIONER:

G. BHAGAVAT SINGH,
AISWARYA, NEDUNGOLAM P.O., NOW RESIDING AT
"SAROJ GANGA", NEDUNGOLAM P.O., KOLLAM.

BY ADV. SRI.G.BHAGAVAT SINGH (PARTY-IN-PERSON)

RESPONDENT/ RESPONDENT:

DAMAYANTHI SUSEELA,
SANJAY BHAVAN, NEDUNGOLAM, PARAVUR VILLAGE, KOLLAM.

BY ADV. SRI.C.UNNIKRISHNAN

THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 04/09/2007, ALONG WITH RP NO. 760 OF 2007
THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

M.N.KRISHNAN,J

=====

R.P.No.757 of 2007 in W.P.(C).No.21099 of 2007

&

R.P.No.760 of 2007 in W.P.(C).No.19820 of 2007

=====

Dated this the 4th day of September, 2007

ORDER

Both the review petitions are preferred against the order passed by me in W.P.(C).Nos.19820 and 21099 of 2007. By the order the court to allowed the amendment application and I confirmed the order of the court below in refusing to issue a new Commission. The learned counsel had urged several contentions before me. So far as the amendment application is concerned, this court only took the view that whether the plaintiff is entitled to the property by virtue of the document relied on by her is a matter to be adjudicated. When a doubt is cast on her title she prays for a declaration to remove the same and this Court found it as prayer sought to be allowed. I do not find any error apparent on the face of the record which calls for review of the judgment passed by me in these two writ petitions. But I am informed by both sides now that there was a time bound direction earlier and much time has lapsed after that. The

R.P.No.757 of 2007 in W.P.(C).No.21099 of 2007&
R.P.No.760 of 2007 in W.P.(C).No.19820 of 2007

:2:

learned counsel for the review petitioner also would submit that he will file the additional written statement within a very short span of time and there can be a time bound direction so that there will be disposal of both the case. Therefore, I direct the court below to dispose of the matter as expeditiously as possible, at any rate, within two months from today. One of the parties can produce a copy of this order before the court below for necessary compliance and Registry is also directed to communicate the same for compliance.

The review petition is disposed of accordingly.

M.N.KRISHNAN,JUDGE

dvs